

**BRAC Semi-Annual Review
Side Meetings
Kelly AFB
28 October 97**

1. Mr. Dave Walsworth of PR welcomed everyone to the BRAC Semi-Review and reviewed the agenda. Col. Young stated today was dedicated to side meetings and was to be informal. Col. Young introduced his staff. Mr. Walsworth introduced AETC personnel and those from the gaining ALCs.
2. Mr. Eusebio Garcia of PR welcomed everyone to the BRAC Semi-Annual Review. Mr. Garcia reviewed the agenda, stating it had been broken out into two main parts. The first day is to consist of informal side meetings, the second day will be formal briefings, and the third day is reserved and to be used only if needed.

Mr. Garcia reviewed the administrative instructions. He stated action items should be written down on the Action Item Worksheets and given to either himself or the KPMG Peat Marwick LLP personnel. Col. Young asked who was going to be in charge of the side meeting review tomorrow. Mr. Garcia stated he would be in charge of the side meeting review.
3. During the discussion on the Master Move (MM) Schedule, Mr. Rudy De Los Santos of PR discussed the purpose and the goals of the side meeting. Mr. De Los Santos stated he wanted to determine the status of the minutes from the 16 Oct 97 MM Template Meeting held at OO-ALC and review the gaining ALCs inputs. Mr. Paulus stated he would have to see if they had been sent out. Col. Young stated the letter went to XP Friday and it should be available. A copy of the draft letter was provided at the meeting. It was confirmed by Col. Young that the 30 Jan date is still the effective date for the initial inputs for the integrated schedules. The gaining ALCs will present briefings concerning their process and status in the Material Management transfer. The SE&V PGM will also present a briefing to discuss how they developed their template. Col. Young mentioned there is more than Material Management transfers. We must also include DMAG in all discussions.
 - A. There was much discussion on the standardization of software to manage the MM DMAG transfers. The general consensus was that Microsoft Project 98 is probably the best alternative. Mr. De Los Santos agreed that we need to come to a consensus for Project 98 vs. Project 4.1. Col. Young directed an action item to both the gaining and losing centers to provide to HQ AFMC/XP-BRAC, Maj. Danny Cooper, the pro's / con's and preference by 7 Nov 97. Mr. Paulus stated the gaining ALCs may have Project 98 available through their LAN administrator. Col. Young mentioned that there are some training issues. Mr. Dennis Hopkins of KPMG stated that there are 70+ users in SA-ALC that would need to migrate to Project 98 and be trained. Mr. Hopkins also mentioned that both SA-ALC and SM-ALC would have to migrate to Project 98 for

standardization. Currently SM-ALC is using Primavera. Col. Young stated that software acquisition is the responsibility of the ALC as part of the cost of doing business. The funds should come out of the ALC's pocket rather than BRAC funding. Col. Young stated training is the responsibility of the ALC. He stated it would be ideal if there is an existing organization or an individual who can train on the application.

Mr. J. R. Ard (WR-ALC/XPXA) presented the WR-ALC Plan for Product Management Relocation. He reviewed the incoming workload from SA-ALC and the slides depicting layouts of buildings to be inhabited by incoming personnel. Mr. Ard discussed the proposed Product Management move to WR-ALC from SA-ALC, consisting of Support Equipment, C-5 and C-17.

Support Equipment has 753 PEs with a space requirement of 87,000 SF. The initial cadre is to transfer FY98 and the positions are a GS 13 and a 12. The remaining personnel are to move between Oct 00-Jul 01. Mr. Ard stated a new directorate (WR-ALC/LE) was formed Sep 97. A question about the early establishment of a cadre was asked. Mr. Ard stated an agreement between both the gaining and losing ALCs has been made to transfer two slots early. He stated they have not gone through the formal notification procedure. Currently Congressional notification is in the coordination cycle. He stated formal notification is on its way up for congressional approval and is being worked through MQ and the two generals agree on the early transfer of the two slots. Mr. Walsworth stated we should see the Congressional notification package shortly. Mr. Pyka stated he is not going to send anyone unless he receives formal notification. Mr. Walsworth asked if the plan calls for that? Mr. Pyka replied no, stating the issue was discussed, but no one ever came up with the slots. Mr. Paulus indicated there is not any guidance on who in the P-Plan will provide slots for the OLs. Mr. Walsworth stated we need to leave the OL issue to the gaining organizations to figure out. The WR-ALC issue regarding the SE PGM is pretty much covered in this plan. Mr. Ard stated they are looking at moving people into existing facilities at WR-ALC.

The C-5 has 175 PEs and requires 18,375 SF. He stated a move schedule has not yet been determined. An IPT is being established and new directorate (WR-ALC/LC) was formed Sep 97. Mr. Ard stated a site survey group determined the upgrade requirements. He stated the designated C-5 areas were in bad shape and furniture was designated for them. Mr. Ard stated over \$6M has been identified, separate from BRAC costs. Mr. Walsworth asked if there are any MILCON requirements or if WR-ALC is just doing in house construction. Mr. Ard stated they are doing in house construction.

Mr. Ard stated the C-17 is a little different. He stated they are looking at 155 PEs and depending on the new flexible sustainment concept, the current guess

might be closer to 60. It was asked how close they are to making a decision. He stated it is an in work decision. On the C-17 the savings will be for privatization. Mr. Ofilio Solano of LC stated they are looking at 40-65 people moving.

Mr. Ard reviewed the locations/buildings where the C-5 and C-17 will take place. He reviewed the Building 300's layout. He stated they are having to move some people around to consolidate some WR-ALC avionics people. Mr. Ard stated if there are any moves to take place sooner than scheduled, WR-ALC will need to be made aware. Mr. Ard stated they are looking at FY99 before everyone will be moved out. Mr. Walsworth asked a hypothetical question, wondering what would happen if SA-ALC should decide to move some of the MM functions early. He asked if WR-ALC would be able to accommodate the early move? Mr. Ard stated they should be able to, but he could not guarantee anything. Mr. Ard stated this scenario has been asked to HQ before and a positive answer was received. Currently projects are occurring at WR-ALC, such as air conditioning renovations, etc. Mr. Walsworth stated they would be playing a lot of "what if" games over the next year or so. During the summary review, Mr. Ard stated the Project Management Transfers are executable and supportable. He stated facility cost is approximately \$1.2M BRAC budget for systems furniture/systems design. Ms. Roche stated Building 300 at WR-ALC is similar to Building 171 at SA-ALC prior to 171's renovation.

B. Ms. Ellen Greenwood of OC-ALC/XPXM reviewed the numbers on the SA-ALC Total Workload Transfer stating 697 PEs will be moving (not including BOS). She stated the number includes 585 for Propulsion, 146 for Aerospace Support Accessories, 31 for Fuel Systems, and 22 for Nuclear Ordnance Commodity (NOCM). She explained the planning process as a cross functional matrix composed of workload IPTs (gaining the workload) and Functionals. The work group, which has been in place for over one year, is composed of OC-ALC workload IPTs, functionals (i.e. FM, PK, TI, EM) and associate members such as DISA, MSG, and 72 ABW. Each OC-ALC workload IPT is integrated with SA-ALC. The functionals at each center are jointly working the issues applicable to their area of expertise and providing the information back up through the workload IPT. The workload IPTs own the workload and ensure the development of detailed actions and milestones. The working group meets monthly and is chaired by XPXM who ensures the plan is integrated and executable. The steering group is chaired by XP and is made up of division level or higher representatives. The purpose is to oversee the process and resolve any issues. The steering group meets monthly. Other efforts include OC-ALC/SA-ALC integrated IPT meetings as required, functional side meetings (local), and OC-SA integrated functional meetings as required. Ms. Greenwood presented a chart revealing communication lines up through XP to PM/S&IO MEB to CC/Corp.

Board. She stated the schedule is in MS Project and will be formatted into the agreed upon Command template. She stated they have developed Internet web pages for all workloads as well as mission planning and beddown. The web site contains minutes, meeting schedules, description of workloads, etc. Ms. Greenwood stated they are working to establish an OC-SA integrated propulsion web site. She stated they need to refine the budget process and determine what is actually in there. She stated they need comprehensive and timely inputs and a notification process. She stated they must know what exactly is in as a baseline to determine what adjustments need to be made. This is only way to know what the shortfalls are, and therefore what the impacts are to the programs. The facilities group established a working group in May 97. Ms. Greenwood stated there is plenty of space available and just need to shuffle personnel around. No MILCON is required. Ms. Greenwood reviewed the Manpower issues, including authorization identification, direct vs. home office, functional breakout, reductions in out-years, organizational structure and tenants. During the discussion on Personnel issues, the following was discussed: establishing OLs, hiring and training requirements, and AFPC assuming some service functions. Mr. Hopkins what the concept is for the OLs. Ms. Greenwood replied that is still up for discussion as to whether the gaining or losing center should control the operating location. Two NOCM issues were discussed: (1) the SA-ALC data system is not compatible with standard systems used at OC-ALC (OC/FMI is working this issue in conjunction with SA-ALC); and (2) the loss of nuclear expertise at SA-ALC as people move to OO-ALC or quit.

During the discussion on Propulsion, Ms. Greenwood stated there have been five transfer planning working group (TPWG) meetings to date. She stated they have determined the charter, focused on organizational structure, and worked the detailed integrated schedule.

During the discussion on ASA /Fuel Systems MGMs Issues, she stated there have not been any division designators available for item manager codes. FMI is working to establish new codes by Jan 98.

During the discussion on Technology and Industrial support issues, Ms. Greenwood discussed the distribution of engineering data and identifying reprourement data by number and type.

During the discussion on FMI (Systems and Financial issues), Ms. Greenwood discussed additional pseudo division codes stating options will be provided to IPTs NLT 30 Nov 97. She discussed identification of items to transfer, req / budget inclusion; and funding (both civilian pay and base operating support). Ms. Greenwood discussed Budget issues, stating both POM and BRAC are critical. She stated they must ensure inputs are timely and funds must be available in the right FY. Ms. Greenwood stated they need to know what is in budget shortfalls in order to determine impacts and alternate source of funds.

During the discussion on contracting issues, she stated SA-ALC and SM-ALC have basic ordering agreements (BOAs).

During the discussion on 72ABW base operating support (BOS), Ms. Greenwood reviewed the plans and support agreements, facilities, household goods movement (summer months), military vehicle increase, communication/computer support (insure adequate communications, infrastructure (file servers, email, comm lines, etc.) in support of current and incoming legacy system and network users.

The following actions were taken for BOS: developing a backup plan for HHG moves (ECD Feb 98) and working with HQ AFMC.

During the discussion on DLA, Ms. Greenwood discussed material handling. She stated they are working with IPTs to Identify quantity, size and workload activity associated with transferring items requiring storage. The following actions were taken: contact with SA-ALC counterparts. There is sufficient space available.

She stated DISA is looking at some mainframe issues. DISA was to move mainframe issues to WR from SA. Mr. Walsworth stated SA-ALC needs to know what the issues are. The current plan is that DISA is going to remain in place and the area has been retained by the Air Force. Ms. Greenwood responded, stating some mainframes are apparently moving to OC-ALC according to DISA. Ms. Greenwood stated she will supply the DISA POC to Mr. De Los Santos and the two POCs (SA-ALC and OC-ALC) can work the issues. During the discussion on MSG, Ms. Greenwood stated they established a transfer plan IPT back in Dec 96. She stated planning is ongoing and the functionals and workload IPTs are working the issues. She stated they are a proactive team and a dedicated planning cadre. Ms. Hendrickson asked if do they had any current facilities' plans for where they will be bedding down the functions. Ms. Greenwood replied yes, stating there is a plan, and most of the beddown will occur in Building 3001. All SA-ALC will be in Bldg 3001. A few SM-ALC will be in other areas.

C. Mr. Mike Williams of OO-ALC briefed the Program Management Reception Planning. He stated the I-Plans lack the necessary detail regarding requirements for facilities and equipment etc. Hopefully this will be addressed in the second generation of I-Plans. Mr. Paulus, DRC, stated the latest version on the HQ version of the I-Plan suggests the I-Plans be reviewed semi-annually and changes will be made with any budgetary changes. OO-ALC has improved the facility since the last time briefed six months ago. Mr. Williams stated paper copies have been made available. Mr. Walsworth asked about MILCON. Mr. Williams responded there is not any MILCON for administrative moves. Ms. Roche stated that the NW move seems to be moving smoothly. Mr. Williams expressed his appreciation for how smooth this move has gone. He stated that in the long term this will be recognized by the customer. He

stated they are currently assuming transition Oct 00 with closure in 01. However, he stated that Ogden is comfortable with early moves if they should occur. He stated some funds for site prep would need to be moved forward. He stated he does not see any major disconnects in regards to BRAC funding if current wedge is maintained.

During the discussion on Strategy for Future Support, the following was discussed: capturing requirements, identifying customers, reviewing processes, initiating process improvement and changes, identifying shortfalls / disconnects and balancing resources in center organizational structure. Critical processes identified were: data system support, financial management, item/production management, contracting and TO's / engineering data.

He stated OO-ALC would like to understand the quantifiable budget numbers to make sure that command has a budgeting process. Ms. McDaniel stated they did not receive past inputs. She stated they also need to understand what was in the budget. Mr. Pyka stated that some folks do not know what is in the budget and what is not included. Mr. Williams reviewed the systems furniture budget issue, stating it is difficult to manage beddown when money went into losing centers vs. the gaining centers budget. He stated PCS and transportation dollars make sense to manage at the losing ALC's, but not systems furniture requirement. Mr. Walsworth stated the law requires that this is included in the losing ALC's budget. He stated that whether or not it is transferred can be addressed at a future time. Ms. McDaniel stated that from a gaining perspective there is a need to know what is included and what is not.

Mr. Paulus brought up the point that there are issues such as tech data and TO's being stored in the centralized facility, which are not addressed in the Plan. Mr. Williams stated the I-Plans lack specifics on how these should be managed. It was stated that TI at the gaining center needs to know so the ALC can gear up for this consolidation.

Mr. Williams discussed the Home Office ICP Responsibilities. He stated the process owner will be FM/FL who will manage policy and procedure, quality control and analysis, training and education, career broadening / training, resource balance and management, and an honest broker for validating requirements.

During the discussion on the Integrated Master Schedule, Mr. Williams stated Ogden supports the AFMC concept. Key assumptions discussed are dual use for PMWC and DMAG workloads, only maintaining a single schedule, and a common work breakdown structure. First actions have been accomplished to download and bridge existing losing center schedules. Mr. Williams stated OO-ALC has some individuals currently using MS Project. TIU would like to train for Project 98 rather than 4.1; but will accommodate the command decision.

During the discussion on the results of Mature and Proven Aircraft, Mr. Williams stated the 21-23 Oct 97 IPT Meeting accomplished the annual I-Plan update. Major issues and concerns are the coordination of the budget and financial requirements and manpower support and transfer (OL implications, funds for personnel). Key Issues identified were: loss of expertise and personal computer needs and policies. Mr. Walsworth stated there is command policy on computer issues. Mr. De Los Santos noted there is a side meeting to discuss this later. In summary, all organizations need to improve communications and emphasize integrated schedules to manage the seamless transition.

D. Mr. Dan Losh briefed the Support Equipment and Vehicle Product Group Manager. Mr. De Los Santos stated that we want to focus in on the standardization process. Mr. De Los Santos introduced Dan Losh. Mr. Losh gave a brief overview on the approach they will be taking. He stated they use the IPT approach and discussed the actions taken using that approach and the use of the WBS and the WBS as a management tool. He stated that the BRAC decision to close requires the transfer of 50% of the inventory. He stated there are nine organizations coming together from four locations to manage 83% of the inventory. Mr. Losh reviewed a list of major partners. He stated they are fortunate to be including the support equipment and policies. Mr. Losh stated they are taking the IPT approach. He stated they have taken the approach to organizational planning and matrixing the workforce. He stated they have taken the team approach on building the master schedule. There are 14 different functional IPTs. WR-ALC serves as the chairman. Mr. Losh stated they use VTC conferencing and TDYs to keep up. Mr. Losh reviewed list of IPTs in place. Mr. Losh reviewed how the teams fell under in the organizational structure. Team leaders traveled from WR-ALC to SA-ALC and had meetings. They discussed MS Project and the WBS structure used in SA-ALC. Mr. Losh stated he has status of information back from the teams and have implemented them into schedule. He stated the IPTs are using VTS and email to continue efforts. IPT leaders are reporting to LDAA for the WBS update in order to avoid any ripples in the system. Mr. Losh stated they are coordinating with PR and upload their schedule onto the base wide WBS. He stated the SEV PGM WBS is an integrated schedule for SEV PGM Partners and is based on SEV PGM Iplan. The schedule includes MM template elements. He stated it identifies the SEV PGM (MM) realignment requirements, tasks, milestones, and progress. WR-ALC has electronic access to the LDA LAN. Mr. Losh stated they have reviewed the major elements to date. He stated they have found the WBS is a good program management tool. He stated they have coordinated changes with PR here in SA-ALC. Mr. Losh stated they use Project as a proactive managing tool. He stated they are keeping an eye on the implementation plan. He stated they are going to continue working closely with SEV PGM partners. He stated they will establish additional

IPTs when they are needed. He stated they are creating a Movers IPT for those who are planning to move to WR. He stated that this IPT will give them a chance to get together and identify loose ends and old issues that need to be worked before we move. He stated they have a web site and are expanding that to include a page on realignment and establishing a bulletin board which may turn into a chat room. He stated they are going to continue the program management approach and will continue maintaining the WBS and Iplan as their planning documents. Mr. Losh stated they draw personnel from organizations outside their own to help in the planning. The WBS falls in nicely with Iplan approach. He stated it continues to grow and currently has over 1100 entries.

- E. Mr. De Los Santos concluded the MM Schedule session by discussing the need to develop a process to communicate with the IPT. Col. Young stated that the HQ AFMC letter has been signed and copies should be available by the end of the review. Mr. De Los Santos remarked that the letter provides guidance that (1) requires the IPTs be started and (2) a first cut of a schedule is due by 31 Jan 98. A focal point for each IPT is required from the losing and gaining center. Mr. De Los Santos stated SA-ALC is providing a status update to HQ AFMC on the last day of each month. Mr. Walsworth stated SA-ALC and SM-ALC will be submitting these schedules initially, then the gaining centers will need to develop a monthly schedule. Mr. De Los Santos stated that once schedules are established a file will be available to HQ AFMC. Col. Young asked when MGen Childress will be briefed. Mr. De Los Santos replied the MGen. is briefed on the last Thursday of the month. Mr. De Los Santos stated there is a need to bring up the software issue. The best for us to do is to bring on MS Project 98. Mr. Walsworth stated the letter calls for using applications 4.1, but the ideal thing might be to discuss this with him so he has something to work with. Mr. Walsworth stated it sounds like Project 98 is the way to go, but there is a need to determine the pros and cons. Ms. Hendrickson stated the advantage would be if you've purchased 4.1 within the past few months. If so you can upgrade to Project 98 for free. She stated you must have a licensed copy of 4.1 or 4.0. Ms. Hendrickson stated that Project 98 is a vast improvement over Project 95. Mr. Walsworth asked what it would take to convert? Ms. Hendrickson stated it would only take about 5 to 10 minutes per file to transfer from 95 to 98. A question was asked about the site licenses. Mr. Hopkins stated that it technically would not require much and there would be many benefits. He stated Project 98 is easier to read and much easier to use. Mr. Walsworth stated the need to consider training time as well as the financials, logistics, etc. Mr. De Los Santos stated there are still some issues on transition that need to be ironed out. As far as the Iplans are concerned, we are being held responsible by submitting the Iplans to the HQ. He stated someone will need to the jobs at the gaining centers. HQ AFMC/XPB will definitely need some input from the gaining centers. Mr.

De Los Santos stated they are looking at trying to standardize a process. A letter has been signed and copies will be available for the gaining ALC's. Col. Young stated Gen. Courter signed on the letter on the 27 Sep and that this is the official notification. Col. Young stated that this should not be news to the folks at WPAFB. Once the IPT is established and gets the focal point, the first input will be needed by the first Tuesday of each month. SA-ALC has a monthly process and briefings are given to the corp. board, etc. Mr. Walsworth asked if we can get them by 30 Jan 98. Mr. Paulus was concerned how the management of the schedule would be funded after the schedule management transitions to the gaining centers. Mr. Walsworth stated we will need to continue to work that issue here at SA-ALC and that we need to work with FM on this issue.

4. Mr. Tommie Jackson, HQ AFMC/SCDX and Mr. Alton Jenkins of SA-ALC/PR briefed the Comm/Mgt Information Issues. Mr. Jackson asked Lt. Col. Gitt of 76 SC/CC to brief the IPMS and software status. Lt. Col. Gitt stated WR-ALC has indicated they want all C-5 ADPE transferred. They have signed a receipt for the rest of the ADPE and are staging information in the IPMS to do an electronic transfer on 3 Nov 97. Lt. Col. Gitt stated 14 pallets of old ADPE equipment has been turned in. He stated software is difficult to inventory due to not knowing what is out there, how it was bought and the combination of site licenses. Lt. Col. Gitt stated they are currently conducting inventories of what is on each processor. He stated there is no real guidance on the disposition which is making this task more difficult. Lt. Col. Gitt stated 76 CS will have a receipt for every processor on account with a serial number and every piece of software on that account. Mr. John Costantino of FM asked if the software will be taken off when the processors transfer. LtCol Gitts stated he is trying to determine whether removing the software will be a requirement. LtCol Gitts briefed the IPMS for C-5 as being complete as of 24 Oct 97. He stated they are currently staging the electronic records. He stated they are using network tools (SMS) to accomplish software inventory. He stated 76 CS will have a listing on what software is on each machine. This information will be transferred to WR-ALC on 3 Nov 97. Lt. Col. Gitt stated some of the processors have multiple copies of Windows 95. He stated not all software is transferable and SA-ALC will look at what the software was bought for and determine if it is transferable. Lt. Col. Gitts stated if the software was bought for an organization whose entire workload is transferring, then our position is that the processor and software should transfer directly up to the gaining center. Mr. Rizzotte of HQ AFMC/XPB stated most software licenses have a educational clause that allows you to transfer to an educational institution. The problem comes if you transfer from a government operation to a commercial operation. Lt. Col. Gitts stated if the systems are given to GKDC, the software will be removed and only the operating system software will be left. Col. Young stated it sounds like a good process is in place. He stated he would like to get Sacramento started on this also. Mr. Williams stated he hopes this is the precedence because he agrees with the process heard here and feels we should implement this way. He asked if a PK representative was present regarding the

RV move and asked if this is the way personal computers will be moved? Ms. Ward of SA-ALC/PKX stated they will do it that way if it is approved. During the discussion on the Tech Order Distribution Office (TODO) Warehouse, it was determined that there is a need to find out who everyone will need to work with to move the hard copies of the TOs out. Mr. Walsworth stated the TOs should be part of the package when the single managers move. Mr. Jackson stated they need to know whether the single managers will be taking the TOs with them. HQ AFMC/EN told Mr. Jackson that the hard copies (T.O.s) that are stored are not in their I-Plan. Mr. Pyka stated they are working as individual directors. Mr. Walsworth stated an Action Item will be created to find out if the TOs will be moving and where they will need to be relocated to. Mr. Walsworth stated there was an issue this morning regarding computers during the MM discussion. He stated a question was asked on how to determine what to put into the BRAC budget for computers. It was stated a HQ AFMC/CV letter dated 27 May 97 has four sections in it outlining computer disposition which also has a decision tree. There is also a HQ AFMC/SC policy letter dated Aug 97 on software. Ms. McDaniel stated that money should be going to the losing centers to continue upgrading computers that will transfer with workload. Mr. Paulus offered to take an action item to get with the single managers and look at the I-Plans and identify TODO relocation.

5. Ms. Polly Sweet briefed Personnel Issues & Manpower. Ms. Sweet stated she would like to go over the budget to see if it would meet everyone's needs. She stated she is concerned that there is not an audit trail for the BRAC funds. Ms. Priscilla Garrett of MQ stated BRAC funding separation is 83 and BRAC separation with restored leave is 78. Ms. Sweet asked about the IPT regarding TOF, TOW and SATAF and when they will be transferring tenants to Lackland AFB. It was stated in January of next year the tenants will move over. A concern was stated that Lackland will be moving to the center in Jan 98. Lackland AFB will want a little time after the move to "settle in", therefore it would be Oct 98 before the move could take place. The RIF is scheduled for Jun 99. She stated it is a matter of making a TDYO determination with Lackland AFB. Ms. Sweet stated she spoke with Air Staff today. She also stated she had spoken with the tenants and the tenants have spoken to their higher headquarters. Ms. Sweet stated that the moves are not impacting them now, but they are beginning to affect mission readiness. Maj. Smith stated this issue was discussed this last year and an early move was discussed. He stated Gen. Newton was against an early move. The AETC timeline has not changed. Actual transition of the civilian workload is not until 2001. Ms. Sweet stated a working group will be created to coordinate this. She stated until the workload is moved under Lackland AFB, Lackland AFB will run a RIF. Maj. Smith stated AETC has not approved an early transfer of tenants prior to 2001. Ms. Sweet stated AFMC HQ would support an early move. She stated tenants at Kelly AFB could come under a RIF. Maj. Smith stated if a change is warranted regarding tenants transferring to Lackland AFB, a package will need to be developed. Mr. Nick stated they are trying to get something to use for a baseline. He stated it will affect other missions we have going on. He stated

all we have is Gen. Childress' approval to explore the possibility of moving early. Mr. Nick also stated when the services are changed the payroll will need to be adjusted so people continue to be paid. Ms. Sweet asked if Mr. Nick is exploring the possibility of moving early. Mr. Nick replied yes. Ms. Sweet asked about the BOS. Mr. Nick stated they are looking at the year 2000. He stated they have taken a look at what may be a transfer of those areas. He stated there is great deal of concern between Kelly AFB and Lackland AFB for numbers. He stated the organizations identified surround the flight line. He stated they have identified the operations squadron and it is an open and shut issue. Mr. Nick stated they are not exclusive operations. A radioactive handling and storage function was identified as moving to Lackland AFB. He stated the communication squad was a surprise. Mr. Nick stated Lackland AFB is an extension of the Kelly AFB communication squadron. Kelly AFB maintains the cables and the instruments. Mr. Nick stated one final area is the reception repatriation in XP. A go, no go decision needs to be made for this area. It was stated Kelly AFB has been a reception repatriation area and it is not known if it will be a transfer of function or not. Ms. Sweet asked if anyone had a ball park figure on the cost of moving. Mr. Nick stated he hasn't concentrated on the figures due to so many areas overlapping. He estimated 100 to 200. Mr. Nick used crash and rescue as an example, stating firefighters are dual qualified. He stated it comes down to what they actually do. Ms. Sweet asked if the people have skills such that the areas would be RIFed. Mr. Nick replied yes. He stated they have completed joint work between the bases. He stated they are setting up an IPT and working jointly. Col. Young asked a question regarding the CARE Office. It was stated there is a cadre of folks doing closure activities. The office will be here for two to four years after closure. The CARE Office will be associated with an ALC (probably OL) off of Tinker AFB. There is a need to determine who the senior person would be and where office would be located. It was stated Col. Purdue is trying to figure out what the EEO would be doing. Col. Young asked if anyone had looked at the size of the CARE office. Mr. Walsworth stated yes, but that they are not locked in on the numbers. Mr. Walsworth stated they are currently refining those numbers pending results from EEO on present litigation. Other functions to support the CARE Office have been identified, but the number of positions have not been identified. All Care Office costs are AFMC cost and not a BRAC fund.

6. During the Budget Issues, Ms. Jeanne Masters stated their FY98 budget for Kelly AFB increased \$4M. Col. Young asked why there were increases. Ms. Masters stated they originally thought personnel would not be registered until 98 so all personnel dollars were put in 98. She stated in 98 they have an increase in materiel. Col. Young stated he needs to understand what necessitates those dollars. Ms. Masters stated the majority of dollars is for personnel separations. She stated currently there are less separations, but the numbers could change. She stated RIF letters have been issued and those employees will be separated Mar 98. Ms. Masters stated they didn't know about is the transfer of C-5 work. She stated they have just been asked to review the requirements and will include the C-5 work in their budget. Col. Young stated the need for more detail to defend

requirements in the budget. Lt. Col. Selden asked how Ms. Masters arrived at these numbers? Ms. Masters responded, stating the breakdown of the budget was reviewed. Lt. Col. Selden stated BRAC is a source of funds, but it is not the only source of funds. Ms. Masters stated DLA does not receive BRAC funding for places where DLA is a tenant. She stated DLA is not getting direct funding. She stated they have been asked to move material out earlier than expected. Ms. Sweet stated there are authorized programs that should be funded by normal funding sources, rather than BRAC. It was stated DOD gets a break / benefit overall as it becomes a lower operating cost. Ms. Master stated the total budget has increased \$4M because of an increase in the RDOs. Ms. Masters stated the budget estimate keeps changing and the next time it might be lower. Lt. Col. Seldon stated everyone has to compete for dollars out of the BRAC fund. Col. Young stated he has to make a choice between paying separation costs or some of the requirements. Ms. Jennie Masters stated the majority of the \$4M budget is for separation costs. She stated they have been asked to submit their requirements and make revisions. Ms. Masters stated this is the best estimate they have right now. Ms. Sweet stated Ms. Masters will need more information to defend her budget because it is fluctuating so much. Ms. Masters stated they do not get DLA BRAC funds to pay for non-DLA BRAC activities, only for those activities that are BRAC related (Ogden distribution center, etc.). Mr. Walsworth stated they want to have the inventory out of the warehouses by Dec 99. Mr. Walsworth asked if DLA is industrial funded. Mr. Walsworth stated the inventory can't just be moved with overhead. Mr. Walsworth stated if you can theoretically use your own money to move goods, then you can use your own money to move DLA assets out. Ms. Masters stated they built the budget on items that they had. It was stated if there is more attrition and disposal there would be a need to know what the issues are and what it is that is being funded. Col. Young stated they would take DLA's case up to MIIT. However, Col. Young stated their budget will be stacked up to what Kelly AFB needs as a whole. Mr. Dave Walsworth stated DLA needs to determine how much they need and when they need it. Mr. Walsworth requested a regularly submitted (monthly) spend plan for DLA and FM personnel. Col. Young stated DLA can plan on receiving the amount of funds as approved in the original FY98 budget; however, DLA is required to provide detailed information on the additional funds requested. DLA will have to "compete" for additional funds along with all other unfunded requests.

7. Mr. Walsworth stated the BRAC budget is being built based on the original plan. He stated he would like to build the budget based on the new plan per Gen. Childress' direction. Mr. Walsworth stated his concern that it doesn't make any sense to submit the budget based on the original data. Mr. Costantino stated that Ms. Sweet's budget was developed on the new information. Col. Young indicated that HQ had adjusted the existing budget based on the new plan. Mr. Costantino stated that he would need to review that budget to ensure that all of the requirements had been included. Col. Young agreed. Col. Young also agreed to a 4 Nov 97 submission for the SA-ALC BRAC budget submission. Mr. Walsworth stated he heard some concern from the gaining ALCs about what is

going on with the budget process. Mr. Walsworth asked if the FM folks are working with the directorates to help them understand the processes. Mr. Walsworth stated that we need to let the gaining centers know what has been included in the budget for their activities.

8. Mr. Walsworth adjourned the Side Meetings. Mr. Walsworth invited all to attend the formal meetings tomorrow. Col. Young stated if you were appointed as an OPR on one of the side meetings he expected you to brief on the side meetings tomorrow.